UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,407	10/11/2005	Richard A. Hager	209546-97839	9494
	7590 03/27/200 MILLER SCHWARTZ	EXAMINER		
38500 WOODWARD AVENUE			PENDLETON, DIONNE	
SUITE 100 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-5048		48	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/27/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/533,407	HAGER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
DIONNE H. PENDLETON	2627	

	DIONNE H. PENDLETON	2627	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 February 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	•	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	iled within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	200100
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They have not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.116	21 See attached Notice of Non Co.	mpliant Amondment (DTOL 324)
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		ripliant Amendment (F 10L-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Wayne R. Young/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2627			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection of claims 27 and 29-33 is maintianed for the following reasons:

- 1. With regard to Applicant's argument that the Locking Member "70" Is Not Integral With The Smith's "Substrater": According to Dictionary.com Unabridged, Integral is define d as "consiting or composed of parts that together constitue a whole." Since the locking member "70", the substrate/headliner portion and other elements, together, constitute the speaker system of Smith, they therefore are fairly interpreted as being integrally formed as claimed.
- 2. Regarding the Applicant's argument the Smith Fails To Teach "Simultaneous Ramping And Rotationally Moving": In Column 4:66-67, Attachment member "70" comprises leg "75", along the length of which, speaker "50" is compressed such that flanges "62" and "64" of the speaker unit passes through aperture "81". The compression of said speaker "50" along the length of leg "75", is interpreted as corresponding the "ramping".

While, Column 5:8-11, clearly teaches a "rotationally moving" attachment member "70".

As a whole, column 4:66 - column 5:11 teach that the compressive force must be applied while rotating said attachment member "71" so as to lock the speaker unit into position, therein teaching "simultaneous ramping and rotationally moving" as claimed. The rejection is therefore maintained, since said "ramping" of claim 27 has not been clearly and distinctly defined as in independent

claims16 and 21..